IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH,

AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

W.P. No. 21553 OF 2005

Date: 06.10.2005

BETWEEN:

M.V. Suryanarayana

.... PETITIONER

And

1. The Principal Secretary to Government, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (Pts.II-A) Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad and others.

.... RESPONDENTS

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 21892 OF 2005

ORDER:

The third respondent is the Sarpanch of Bhattiprolu Gram Panchayat. The District Collector, the second respondent herein issued a show cause notice in sub-section (6) of Section 249 of A.P. Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (for short 'the Act') calling upon the third respondent to show cause as to why she should not be suspended for certain irregularities. Challenging the said show cause notice, the third respondent approached the Government by way of appeal. By an order made in G.O.Rt.No.1292, dated 12.7.2005 the Government rejected the appeal. The third respondent submitted an explanation, and after considering

the explanation the District Collector by proceedings dated 9.9.2005 came to the conclusion that the third respondent having been elected as Sarpanch in 1/3rd reservation quota should be given an opportunity for introspection, and accordingly warned her to be more responsible. However, the District Collector thought it fit to direct the District Panchayat Officer to withdraw the cheque drawing powers of the third respondent. In this writ petition the petitioner, who is a Ward Member of Eighth Ward of Bhattiprolu village, assails the proceedings of the District Collector dated 9.9.2005.

At the stage of preliminary hearing, the learned Assistant Government Pleader brought to the notice of this Court that aggrieved by the impugned proceedings, the petitioner already approached the Government by way of revision petition, which is pending. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that pursuant to impugned proceedings of the District Collector, the cheque drawing powers of the third respondent are withdrawn, aggrieved by which she filed revision petition before the authority, which is pending. In this background, this Court is not inclined to go into the merits of the case nor decide the question of locus standi of the petitioner to assail the orders of the District Collector under Section 249(6) of the Act. If so advised, the petitioner may approach the Government for expeditious disposal of the revision petition.

The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed at the admission stage.

_____

(**V.V.S. RAO, J.)**

6th October, 2005

Js